

## REMARKS

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his consideration of the pending claims. Claims 1-30 are currently pending in this application. In the Office Action mailed October 16, 2006, the Examiner has rejected 1-30.

Claims 1, 6, 13, 16, 18-22, 24, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. 6,345,168 to Pitts (Pitts) in view of U.S. 5,897,238 to Hockey et. al. (Hockey). The Applicants agree with the Examiner in that "Pitts does not disclose expressly turning the power to the charger on and off." but the Applicants strongly disagree with the Examiner's statement that Hockey "discloses turning the power to the charger on and off (see column 5 lines 3-4, column 5, lines 60-column 6, line 20, and column 6 line 47 -column 7, line 20)." It is well established that the ordinary meaning of a term refers to the ordinary meaning to a person skilled in the art at the time the application was filed after having read the claim term both in context of the claim and in the context of the entire specification. Hockey does not describe a detach charger that "enables or disables said detach charger in response to a sheet weight of paper fed." All these sections discuss is that power is supplied. There is no discussion of the invention described in the present application.

As discussed in the Applicants' application, and clearly understood by those skilled in the art, the words "enables or disables" in the claims of an application, when given their ordinary meaning using the specification as a basis of that meaning, are not rendered obvious by Pitts in view of Hockey. Hockey (5,897,238) does not discuss turning off the detach charger during the operation. In the present invention the only information that is required is the weight of the paper, and specifically in the preferred embodiment, if the paper weight is above or below a limit. Accordingly the charger is turned on or off for the entire sheet. No differential treatment is needed and knowledge of the paper size is also not required.

The Applicants know the cited Hockey well since one inventor (Walgrove) is a co-inventor on Hockey (5,897,238). As a co-inventor on Hockey Walgrove states that :


Patent, 5897238, discusses a charger that has two operating modes. The first mode is a “setup” mode where the charger is setup to deliver a specific polarity charge to a charging surface for the sole purpose of properly adjusting the position of the charger so that during normal operating mode (printing), the charger will deliver the correct amount of charge to the charging surface. As the end of this setup mode, the charger is turned off, and the machine is cycled down. During normal operation of the machine (printing mode), the charger is run in a “normal” mode where the charger is setup to deliver a polarity opposite to the polarity used during the “setup” mode. At the end of the printing cycle this charger is turned off and the machine is cycled down. It is clear that the nature of the patent has nothing to do with turning the charger on and off. This is what any machine would do at the end of an operating cycle or mode. The patent is disclosing a method that can be used to properly adjust the spacing of a charger during a setup mode, which is distinctly different when compared with the setup used during normal printing mode.

Independent claims 1, 11, 12, 13, 20, and claim 29 claim a detach charger that is enabled and/or disabled in response to a sheet weight of paper fed into the printing apparatus. The specification clearly describes that when the power supply is shut off (AC power) “the charger is not enabled” and that the charger “is enabled by applying an AC voltage to the charger wire”. (pg 8, lines 27-31). The specification continues to describe the enable signal that is sent when the weight of the receiver sheet S is greater than the receiver weight limit. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Pitts in view of Hockey and the other cited patents does not make the present claimed invention (independent claims 1, 11, 12, 13, 20, and 29) or the claims dependent thereon obvious.

The other cited art does not add anything to Pitts and Hockey that would make it obvious to replace the DC signal used in Pitts with the “AC” control as claimed by the Applicants. In fact, as discussed above, Pitts does not even discuss controlling the AC. Finally, with respect to the other art cited, the Applicants respectfully submit that they do not provide sufficient objective motivation, for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art, to modify Pitts in the manner attempted.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-30 are allowable in their present form, without a restriction, and hereby request such allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned in the event that a phone interview will expedite prosecution of this application towards allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 47,979

Donna P. Suchy/tt  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-722-9844  
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.